## Pure Resolutions LLC

An Independent Review Organization 990 Hwy. 287 N. Suite 106 PMB 133 Mansfield, TX 76063

Email:pureresolutions@irosolutions.com

Fax Number: (817) 385-9613

## Notice of Independent Review Decision

Cas	e Number:	Date of Notice: 11/20/2015
Revi	iew Outcome:	
	escription of the qualifications for each physician or iewed the decision:	other health care provider who
Orth	nopedic Surgery	
Des	cription of the service or services in dispute:	
umb	oar MRI with and without contrast	
•	on Independent review, the reviewer finds that the pre erse determinations should be:	evious adverse determination /
$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	Upheld (Agree)	
	Overturned (Disagree)	
	Partially Overturned (Agree in part / Disagree in part)	

## Patient Clinical History (Summary)

Phone Number:

(817) 779-3288

Patient is a male. On 11/26/12, a medical record review noted that previous MRI findings were reviewed. It was noted the need for current and/or future treatment did not appear to be warranted at that time. On 08/27/15, the patient returned to clinic and he reported intermittent pain to the low back and legs. An MRI was reviewed showing a recurrent herniated disc at L5-S1. He had an antalgic gait on the exam, and straight leg raise was positive right greater than left. An MRI with and without contrast to evaluate the current disc was recommended. On 10/08/15, the patient returned to clinic. On exam, he had a positive straight leg raise at 15 degrees on the right and 30 degrees on the left.

Analysis and Explanation of the Decision include Clinical Basis, Findings and Conclusions used to support the decision.

On 09/25/15, an adverse determination letter was submitted for the requested MRI of the lumbar spine with and without contrast, and it was noted the submitted documentation did not describe the presence of any new changes on neurological exam compared to previous exams to support the request.

On 10/29/15, an adverse determination letter was submitted again noting that the request was non-certified, as there was a lack of documentation of objective findings on physical examination suggesting significant pathology such as neural compression or recurrent disc herniation.

The guidelines state repeat MRI of the lumbar spine should be reserved for those patients who have documented significant change in symptoms and objective assessment, or if there is a question of tumor or infection. The records do not reflect a significant change in findings, and there is no indication if infection and or tumor.

It is the opinion of this reviewer that the request for a lumbar MRI with and without contrast is not medically necessary.

## A description and the source of the screening criteria or other clinical basis used to make the decision:

	ACOEM-America College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine um		
	knowledgebase AHCPR-Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Guidelines		
	DWC-Division of Workers Compensation Policies and		
	Guidelines European Guidelines for Management of Chronic		
	Low Back Pain Interqual Criteria		
<b>√</b>	Medical Judgment, Clinical Experience, and expertise in accordance with accepted medical		
	standards Mercy Center Consensus Conference Guidelines		
	Milliman Care Guidelines		
<b>√</b>	ODG-Official Disability Guidelines and Treatment		
	Guidelines Pressley Reed, the Medical Disability Advisor		
	Texas Guidelines for Chiropractic Quality Assurance and Practice		
	Parameters Texas TACADA Guidelines		
	TMF Screening Criteria Manual		
	Peer Reviewed Nationally Accepted Médical Literature (Provide a description)		
П	Other evidence based, scientifically valid, outcome focused guidelines (Provide a description)		